LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

The Speech at Peking

THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY

On an Article by Engels

J. V. STALIN

The New Fabians

JOHN GOLLAN

August, 1952

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLANE PASSING OVER

As people went back to work after their August Bank Holiday thirty eight years ago, they found themselves at war. That day they did not know that historians were to call this World War I. Thirty one years later, with World War II in Europe over, another Bank Holiday dawned. On that morning 80,000 people died in Hiroshima as a single plane passed over; and before the week was through, 40,000 more met their death at Nagasaki. For President Truman had taken the decision to drop on them the first two atom bombs 'in order to shorten the agony of war, in order to save the lives of thousands and thousands of young Americans.' That, at least, was what he said. Others drew different conclusions, among them that distinguished British scientist who wrote that it 'was not so much the last military act of the second world war, as the first act of the cold war with Russia.' Look at the drawings on pages 360-1. Many of us, like that youth, may be taking our ease this Bank Holiday on beach or hill-top. As we hear a plane pass over, some may recall the words of the war poet.

I hear an aeroplane—what years ahead
Who knows?—but if from that machine should fall
The first bacterial bomb, this world might find
That all the aspirations of the dead
Had been betrayed and blotted out, and all
Their deeds denied who hoped for Humankind.

These despairing words were written years ago, before the leaders of the Christian Churches of China had occasion to write the appeal that we print on page 362, an appeal to the peoples of the world 'to shorten the agony of war.' And the peoples of the world can do it. We need not accept the despair of the poet, for we can truly say of all terror weapons what Mao Tse-tung said of the atom bomb: 'The birth of the atom bomb marks the beginning of the end of the American imperialists. For they base their calculations on the bomb and not on the people. In the end of ends, it is not the bomb that will destroy the people, but the people who will destroy the bomb.'

'THE SEA OF LIES'

It is remarkable how many readers' letters refer to press and radio lies and the help they get in breaking this web from *Labour Monthly*, 'our grand source of true information in a sea of lies.' Virtually every letter from the United States, in particular, stresses this. This is an indication both of the pressure of U.S. propaganda *media* and at the same time the alertness of sane Americans to the fact that their press is not to be trusted. One reader, writing from California of how *L.M.* is valued 'in this benighted land', gives examples: 'I learned of the low morale of our troops in Korea first from R.P.D.'s Notes. Later it had to be grudgingly admitted by a few writers here. Then there was Mr. Pritt's article about *The Press and Germ Warfare*. I had found nothing in our press about the investigation by the Lawyers' Commission—nothing but self-righteous lying denials of guilt. Ours is certainly a soundproof curtain.' From the

Continued inside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIV, No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1952

	Page
THE NEW FABIANS: by John Gollan	337
FRESH CURRENTS IN BRITISH POLITICS: by E. M. Winterton ...	346
FRENCH LESSONS: THE DUCLOS CASE: by D. N. Pritt, Q.C.	351
THE SPEECH AT PEKING: by Dr. Hewlett Johnson	357
ON AN ARTICLE BY ENGELS: by J. V. Stalin	364
SOUTH AFRICAN FASCISM: by Moses Kotane	369
A LETTER TO THE QUEEN	376
TWENTY FIVE YEARS AGO	384
CARTOONS: by Frans Masereel	360—61
Book Review:	
The Hidden History of the Korean War, by I. F. Stone: *T. McW.* ...	383

The customary Notes of the Month by R.P.D. are held over as the Editor is engaged in the completion of his new book, "The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire" which will be published early in the New Year.

THE NEW FABIANS

JOHN GOLLAN

THE crisis of policy in the labour movement is not the result of rearmament or the electoral defeat of 1951. It is the crisis of the entire reformist Right Wing policy which was already clearly visible in 1947 and 1948. By that time the leaders of the Labour Government had already committed Britain to the Anglo-American war alliance against socialism and the U.S.S.R.

Nationalisation and social reform were being declared closed episodes. At the 1948 Labour Party Conference, Morrison was already arguing that the problem was not more nationalisation but that Ministers must be allowed 'adequate time to consolidate, to develop, to make efficient, or more efficient, the industries which have been socialised . . . we have now established, or shall have done by July, the structure of our social legislation and our social security organisation . . . Let us prepare for a victory of consolidation . . . ' Dalton was already justifying the so-called 'mixed economy' and the profit motive, and Cripps was declaring that 'redistribution' of incomes by the taxation of the rich had reached its limit. Labour Government policy became

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever more clearly exposed as the wage freeze, all-out attack on the social services, a cut-throat export drive, savage colonial war and intensified colonial exploitation, class collaboration for increased production—an all-out effort to solve capitalism's crisis at the expense of the working class. It culminated in the monstrous ruinous arms drive.

The 1950 Election programme, *Let Us Win Through Together*, summed up the position. In 1945 *Let Us Face the Future* could say: 'The Labour Party is a socialist party and proud of it.' The 1950 programme called for a new moral order, not a new social order. The only mention of socialism was the sentence 'Socialism is not bread alone'. The class struggle was outlawed, the slogan was not social change but 'individual' change. Not a single social reform measure was proposed. The keynote was raise production and cut costs, class collaboration, encouragement for private enterprise. But there was still vague promise of some kind of nationalisation—sugar, cold storage, meat distribution, cement and industrial insurance.

With the 1951 Election manifesto these last remnants of nationalisation proposals had gone. It was a programme for the complete consolidation of capitalism concealed behind the vague generalities, and *The Times* could comment acidly in an editorial:

> The word 'nationalisation' does not even appear . . . A close reading of the document reveals only one hard proposal: the Labour Government it appears are seeking a renewal of their mandate so that they may 'set up new auction markets in provincial towns'. (October 10, 1951.)

All this reveals the utter bankruptcy of official reformism. Not only is the defence of capitalism and British imperialism its policy in fact, the vague declarations of socialism and social reform of the past can no longer be tolerated. All is sacrificed for the Anglo-American alliance and preparation for war, now the very pith and essence of reformist policy.

But betrayal at the top is only one side of the picture. The other, vital side, is the ever-growing revolt of the movement below, the developing disillusionment arising out of six years of reformism in office, and the consequent search of the best of the Labour movement for a new, genuinely socialist policy. That policy was presented for the consideration of the entire movement in the publication by the Communist Party of *The British Road to Socialism*. Its effects have been profound. With such a programme, so sharply in contrast with the reformist manifestoes, offering such a powerful appeal to the movement on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one hand, and the rising mass movement against Right Wing policy of toleration and virtual alliance with the Tory Government, the wages movement and growing strike actions, the revolt over Korea and American domination on the other, reformism has had to act.

It is on this turbulent developing background that the so-called re-thinking of the *New Fabian Essays** has got to be considered. There is little important in them which has not already been said by the Right Wing leaders. Their purpose is to 're-define' socialism so as to rob it of its essence, the destruction of capitalism and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. It is to put a philosophical gloss on Right Wing betrayal, to justify the American alliance and rearmament, to condemn class struggle and preach class collaboration and reconciliation with capitalism.

Most important from this point of view, and certainly the most pretentious, is Crossman's introductory essay with the grandiose title 'Towards a Philosophy of Socialism'. British Labour has 'lost momentum' he says, not because of Right Wing betrayal, but because there 'was no theoretical basis for practical programmes of action'. There is no defined trend in history towards freedom, democracy and socialism. Exploitation and slavery is the normal state of man, the brief periods of liberty are to be seen as tremendous achievements. This is his case.

> This is the point of departure for a modern theory of Socialism. Instead of regretting social change as tending towards the enlargement of freedom, we must assume that increased concentration of power, whether in the form of technological development or social organisation, will always produce exploitation, injustice and inequality in a society, unless the community possesses a social conscience strong enough to civilise them.

Every economic system he continues, 'whether capitalist or socialist' degenerates in this way 'unless it is policed by a social morality, which can only reside in a *minority* of citizens'. In the 19th century this was the task of the Liberals; now it is the task of the socialists. There has been a political revolution, he writes, which has concentrated coercive power and thought control in a few hands. This is an historical fact as important as the industrial revolution, he argues. Those who control the media of mass communication and means of destruction (propaganda and

* Edited by R. H. S. Crossman. With essays by Crossman, C. A. R. Crosland, Roy Jenkins, Margaret Cole, Austen Albu, Ian Mikardo, Denis Healey and John Strachey. Turnstile Press, 215 pp. 15s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed forces) 'are far more powerful today than the owners of the means of production. The State is no longer the executive committee of the bourgeoisie; the bourgeoisie are becoming the managers working for the State', and his conclusion is: 'Today the enemy of freedom is the managerial society and the central coercive power that goes with it . . . just as capitalism *could* be civilised into the welfare state, so the managerial society can be civilised into democratic socialism.'

Throughout all this rubbish there is a clearly defined purpose. It is to detract attention *à la* Burnham from the real enemy, monopoly capitalism, to an imaginary enemy, the managerial society. It is to slur over the real essence of class power and to replace the mass class struggle against the Tories, for living standards, peace and fundamental social change by an enlightened élite of Crossman's who are keepers of the nation's conscience, out to save immoral society, including the senseless working class, against its will. One is reminded irresistibly of Engel's brilliant characterisaton of the earlier Fabians:

> Haughty bourgeois, graciously descending to the proletariat to liberate it from above, if only it will have the insight to understand that such a raw, uneducated mass cannot liberate itself, and can attain nothing without the favour of those clever attorneys, litterateurs, and sentimental females. (Letter of November 11, 1893).

Their fundamental principle, Engels said, is 'fear of revolution'. their specific tactics are those of 'hushing up the class struggle.' But it would be a mistake to class these new Fabians with those whom Engels castigated. These early Fabians were victims of their own illusions.* The new Fabians have deliberately set out to paralyse the working class movement and, if it were possible, to save the tottering class system.

Crossman refuses to allow a defined trend in history because he knows and fears like the plague, history's clearly established trend, the replacement of capitalist property and exploitation with socialism and freedom by the gravediggers of capitalism, the working class. The concentration of power today is not a Crossmanite abstraction, it is capitalist monopoly and the social organisation is the capitalist state, whose purpose is to preserve profit and exploitation. This trend was foretold by Marx in his words in *Capital* on the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisa-

*But the Webbs, to their honour, wrote *Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation* —and Shaw stood by the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of labour reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. 'This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.' Today all this is living reality. A third of mankind has expropriated the expropriators and embraced Socialism. From Eastern Europe through the Soviet Union to People's China, it has found freedom. Exploitation and slavery has been abolished never to return.

But for Crossman to admit this would be to admit the bankruptcy of reformism. Yet the workers know that there are no employers and exploiters in the Soviet Union, while they have to fight bitterly for a living wage here. So Burnham's myth of the managerial society is resuscitated and the grotesque effort is made to present the U.S.S.R. as the 'worst type' of managerial society. But who are the managers of capitalist society? The capitalists themselves or highly paid slavedrivers operating the decision of the boards of directors. Who are the managers of Socialist society? The workers graduated from the ranks, operating socialist property in an harmonious co-operative partnership for the social use having abolished exploitation and wage slavery.

The social 'conscience' of capitalism is his second myth. It is not the Crossmans who have wrenched the democratic rights and social reforms from capitalism but the working class, by hard and bitter class struggle. What is this Political Revolution, to give it Crossman's capital letters, but the monopoly of capitalism and high finance over the B.B.C., Television and the millionaire press, its social ideological control over education and the exclusive staffing of the leading positions in the police and the armed forces by men of its class?

The ugly reality of this pseudo philosophy emerges with brutal clarity when the new Fabians discuss foreign policy. It is no accident this essay is contributed by Denis Healey, the late Ernest Bevin's protegé and apologist. Central to their case is unqualified approval of the Anglo-American war alliance and that the enemy is not imperialism but the Soviet Union. Healey lashes out against the anti-imperialist feelings of the Labour workers. Power politics is the thing. When did any State possess such altruism as the League of Nations demanded, he sneers. But he hastens to add that these criticisms 'do not apply to the foreign policy of the two brief pre-war Labour Govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments and still less to the post-war foreign policy of Ernest Bevin, a man with those qualities of character, judgment and imagination which go to make a great Foreign Secretary.' Bevin's greatest personal contribution, he writes, was in helping to guide America into the 'power vacuum' after the war, that is, to assist America to hegemony over the capitalist world. The new Fabian imperialists are content to be the junior partners of the new aggressive American imperialism. He scorns all talk of a World Plan for Mutual Aid. Relations with (that is, submission to) the United States is the central problem of British foreign policy, he writes. The alliance with America is a condition of Britain's survival and Britain must rearm.

This is too crude for Mr. Crossman's conscience. He fears the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples and the 'democracy' of the Syngman Rhee type stinks to high heaven. He tries to explain the mass national liberation movement away and sows his hatred of the common people by claiming that it is merely a movement of an élite of dissatisfied intelligentsia, almost Crossmans!

> The coolie in Malaya, or for that matter the tribesman in Nigeria, does not want *either* liberty, equality and fraternity, *or* the dictatorship of the proletariat. He is below the level of such political aspirations.

Full-throated support of the Atlantic Alliance yes, but the 'task' of socialist foreign policy is to exercise 'restraint' when the Americans become too blatant and tough. Truly the 'conscience' of an indiarubber man.

Despite six years of Labour rule the working class is still convinced that they are living under capitalism with the fight for wages and conditions raging as bitter as before. This is the problem for the new Fabians. So the essayists try hard to convince the sceptical battling workers that a revolution has taken place. Labour has brought about an 'inviolable' change in the social climate boasts Crossman, 'a change equal in importance with the liberal revolutions of 1832 and 1906.' The bold Mr. Crosland goes further. Capitalism has been replaced by what he calls statism and 'by 1951 Britain had in all the essentials ceased to be a capitalist country'. Statism, he confidently asserts 'represents a major social revolution'. Strachey finds the revolution in the 'fact' of the alleged redistribution of the national income by taxation policy.

When the details of the revolution are listed by the new Fabians they boil down to four claims—all of them more or less

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fraudulent. They are:—the abolition of unemployment by the Keynsian sleight of hand; the end of capitalist economic stagnation—the trend of production and the standard of life is 'strongly upward' (Strachey); the enormously increased power of the State (through central planning, controls, nationalisation and budget policy)—'it is now an independent intermediate power, dominating the economic life of the country' (Crosland); redistributive taxation and the Welfare State.

The unfortunate new Fabians had hardly got their book into the press when remorseless economic reality and the developing capitalist crisis had exposed their prospectus as a fraudulent one. Their super-confident grandiose claims are already in the process of being shattered just as the similar claims in 1928 of managed capitalism and Fordism having replaced Marx were shattered by the great world crisis of 1929 onwards.

In less than twelve months, full employment has given way to the sharp rise in unemployment, doubling to 467,000 with hundreds of thousands on short time, so that around a million workers are more or less unemployed in Britain today. The rise in production, dilated on at length by Strachey as a fundamental change in capitalism, has ceased. The capitalist economy has reached stagnation once again and is entering a period of decline in spite of the huge armaments drive. Between 1949 and 1950 the official index of production showed an increase of 8.5 per cent. Between 1950 and 1951 the increase had dropped to 2.8 per cent. In the first five months of 1952 the index showed no advance at all compared with the first five months of 1951. The fall in living standards as every industrial worker knows, has been catastrophic. From January, 1951 to April, 1952, the wage index rose by 12 points. During the same period the price index rose by 18 points, or 50 per cent more. Between the first quarter of 1951 and the first quarter of 1952, purchases in the shops and stores of Britain declined by 11.9 per cent in constant prices. Today they are lower in constant prices than in 1949.

No one takes all this Fabian nonsense about Socialist planning seriously, least of all the capitalist class. This is made clear by their attitude to the 1950 Economic Survey of the Labour Government. A humble document, meek almost to the point of being meaningless. In these words the *Economist* derides it, adding: 'There is nothing here of the notions of "democratic planning" as proclaimed in earlier surveys.' And the *Manchester Guardian*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mocked: 'Perhaps economic planning will start again next year. It has never been much more than a pretext, and the dropping of even the pretence is the most notable feature of this year's Economic Survey.'

The redistribution fraud consists of palming off rent, interest and dividends after tax, instead of rent, interest and profit. When undistributed profits are added, the share of the national income (after tax) going to the capitalist class went *up* from 32 per cent in 1946 to 35 per cent in 1950 and that of wages and forces pay down from 47 to 43 per cent. In other words, the Labour Government is redistributing to the advantage of capitalism.

The attack on 'the Welfare State', begun by the Labour Government and continued by the Tories, is now in full swing.

The keynote of the job attempted by the Essayists is sounded when they deal with the next steps for the labour movement. They make an undiluted appeal for class collaboration in defence of capitalism. Faced with the facts of class antagonism and struggle, the facts of wealth concentrated in the grip of a few despite all their talk of revolution, they fall back—on psychology. Crossman wants a national wage policy to by-pass the wages struggle now menacing the virtual coalition of the right wing and the Tories at the top. The main task of socialism today, he writes, is to prevent the concentration of power in the hands of either the industrial managements or the state bureaucracy. 'In brief, to distribute responsibility so as to enlarge the freedom of choice'. A formula for class collaboration, no assault on monopoly capitalism.

Crosland defines socialism as 'approximate social and economic equality'. The problem, he says, is not so much 'a residue of objectively measurable social inequality' (the capitalist 1 per cent hold 50 per cent of the national wealth—some residue!) but the persistence of a deep-rooted *sense* of unequal society. 'The purpose of socialism' he writes 'is quite simply to eradicate this *sense* of class, and to create in its place a *sense* of common interest and equal status'. There it is. A psychological confidence trick in place of social change, the quickness of Mr. Crosland's pen is to deceive the workers' eye. Naturally, enough, Mr. Crosland's next step is on what he calls the 'socio-psychological plane'. Not controls, social services, or nationalisation, but the 'right organisation' of industry 'constitutes the central problem of our time'. The crucial issue here, he writes, is not that of 'social control', but

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the 'psychology of industrial relations' which are bedevilled by the workers' hostility to profits and dividends. This might be met by some dividend limitation and some workers' representation on the board of directors, is his conclusion.

Austen Albu, managerial expert, supplies the solution. He agrees that the problem is one of 'the restoration of a *feeling* of participation and common purpose among the workers, which is missing from capitalist industrial society'. He advocates some changes in Company Law, with the Government appointing some representatives to the boards of directors and those working in an industry also electing some by ballot. This is also Strachey's solution.

Mikardo wages war on the 'backward' trade unionists who stubbornly refuse to recognise that we are in a brave new world and the 'traditional' class war weapons are 'outmoded'. He wants a new type of two-tier central machinery for the unions. A bigger General Council and an inner cabinet of big T.U. chiefs who have severed their connections with individual unions and who would 'hire the best available advisers in all its fields of work—not least in the fields of industrial organisation and management'. The Fabian Essayists seem to believe in the managerial revolution and concentration of power when it is applied in the trade unions against the rank and file.

So there it is. And is it any wonder that the same capitalist press and politicians which does not hide its sneers at Fabian 'planning', knowing it to be a fake, but whose main concern, at this critical stage in war and peace, is to damp down the rising class struggle and demoralise the labour movement, have boosted to the skies this anti-trade union and anti-working class conception?

In doing so, they are not only concerned about immediate ends, but the long term issues of class power and class rule, the attempt to kill the confidence of the working class in its historic mission.

It is not enough to say that the good sense of the workers will reject this poisonous rubbish and the whole ideological offensive of the right. It must not only be systematically exposed and counterposed by a real programme of socialism. Side by side with the exposure, must go the systematic effort to unite all sections of the labour movement in a common programme of immediate militant struggle against capitalism and the right wing reformists, for wages, peace and the defeat of the Tories.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the decisions of the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party and its appeal and programme for united action and in *The British Road to Socialism,* the real solutions to the problems of the labour movement are to be found.

FRESH CURRENTS IN BRITISH POLITICS

E. M. WINTERTON

A NEW phase is opening in British politics. In vain did the Trades Union Congress General Council, on the morrow of the Tory victory last October, rush to assure the new Government of its readiness to co-operate. The workers steadily pressed on with their wages demands. In vain did the General Council, in May, renew its pressure on the workers to restrain these demands, with an apologia for rearmament unique in the history of the labour movement. By mid-July the spokesmen of two million more wage-earners had shown what they thought of the 'lead' from Transport House by tabling new wage claims, bringing the total involved up to approximately seven millions.

Even the General and Municipal Workers' Union after passing a resolution supporting rearmament at its Whitley Bay Conference on June 18, adopted another, the following day, calling on the Government to do what the delegates knew perfectly well no Tory Government will do except under dire compulsion—tax profits and limit dividends 'vigorously'—failing which 'attempts to restrict justifiable wage increases would be rejected'. And Arthur Deakin himself, at the Post Office Engineering Union's Eastbourne conference on the 18th, had 'eaten lion', as the French say, accusing the Tory Government of destroying confidence by refusing to co-operate, and threatening it with the consequences.

Can anyone doubt after the previous experience of Labour victories at the local elections, that the cause of this change of tone was the uneasy feeling of the right-wing leaders that the ground is slipping from under them? If anyone did, the sustained demand for militant action at the Labour League of Youth conference in June should clinch the point.

Little by little, too, the patience of the British people is reaching breaking point about the Americans. The never ceasing flood

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of resolutions and letters of protest to M.P.s, as week by week some new atrocity of the Americans in Korea is revealed—forcible and illegal 'screening' of prisoners, followed by their cold-blooded public murder: deliberate sacrifice of British soldiers' lives and of the freedom of British prisoners of war by arrogant American generals at the Panmunjom negotiations; the provocative bombings on the Yalu river in the hope of breaking negotiations up altogether—the anger of the British people at all this is beginning to tell. In vain did the right-wing Labour leaders openly flout their own M.P.s' decision by putting down a 'vote of censure' which was no censure at all. They found themselves in a minority in their own group meeting on July 1, saved only by some 100 abstentions: so many Labour people are still reluctant to draw conclusions from their realisation that they were lied to about the origins of the Korean war, about its character and about American policy. On German rearmament the combined efforts of Churchill and his Labour front bench opponents have not prevailed to prevent the Labour Party being committed to the demand for Four Power negotiations and new elections in Western Germany. Strong A.E.U. and N.U.R. resolutions on the war peril will be echoed at September's T.U.C.

When even Herbert Morrison—who threw away the chance of improving Anglo-Soviet relations, last year, by his vicious anti-Soviet interview for *Pravda*—now calls for 'a new and happier chapter in Anglo-Soviet relations' (June 22): when Sir Hartley Shawcross, so long a violent attacker of the Soviet Union, suddenly calls for 'a meeting of heads of States' (June 21)—the proposal which Attlee so often rejected—who will believe that this change is not due to these Labour leaders' awareness of a deep-seated movement of alarm and anger?

The Tories certainly are aware of it: and this accounts for the sudden outburst of disquiet and uncertainty among them, in the last fortnight of June. There is 'confusion' in the Tory ranks, wrote the *Sunday Times* (June 15). Criticism of Churchill among them 'is no longer concealed', said the *Economist* (June 21), and discussed the possibility that criticism might 'grow into pressure on him to retire'. Conservative back benchers are 'touchy and rebellious', said the *Observer* (June 22), and spoke of 'the snarling off-stage' among them at the 'weak and vacillating' policy of the Government. *The Times* went so far as to speak of 'a failure of policy' and 'disappointment', and admitted that 'much is being

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said in private' about Churchill's ability to give the Tory Government 'direction and cohesion'. Referring to a heavy gain for Labour in Gallup Poll findings published by the *News Chronicle* on June 23, the *Economist* added that 'a considerable reshuffle cannot be long postponed' (June 28). And in spite of a private pep-talk by Churchill to the Conservative Members' Committee that week, which the *Sunday Times* commentator affected to believe had 'cleared the air and heartened the doubters and weaklings' (June 29), he himself was forced to admit 'the malaise in the Conservative Party', Tory M.P.s 'irritable and touchy', with 'a fear of defeat among them', many Ministers 'relatively new and inexperienced', evidence of 'loss of electoral support'—and the like, deploring that what Churchill said to the M.P.s was treated in so hush-hush a fashion.

Now it is important to draw the right conclusions from such admissions of obvious importance. The Tory dissatisfaction with the Churchill leadership is not due—except in one or two honourable cases, like Lord Hinchinbrooke's protest against the Yalu bombings—to a patriotic disgust at the economic ruin and servitude into which Churchill's policy is leading the country. It is due to the realisation that, having told potential conservative voters at the General Election last October, a tarradiddle about the golden age which Tory rule would bring them, the Tory Party leaders are now flinching at the rising tide of disillusionment and disgust. It is this which prompts the criticism, in the Tory journals of the Government's successive withdrawal of its initial proposals for denationalising road transport and for the government of the B.B.C., and of its failure—so far—to bring forward denationalisation of the steel industry (an indication of the deep division in opinion, in face of the workers' feelings, was incidentally given by *The Times* on June 24 asserting: 'It is unlikely that the call for early denationalisation of iron and steel will be revived for some time,' while Churchill the same day—according to the *Sunday Times* of June 29—'reassures the party that the Government intend to stick to their election policy of denationalisation'). It was not love of the people that prompted Tory protests against the modification in the proposed passenger fares increases, or maintaining the (pretty poor) housing programme. On the contrary, it was hatred of the people, disappointment that in office the Tory Party had not proved what the *Economist* called on June 21 a 'businesslike party', steering 'a straight, even at times a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

severe, course' (*Observer*, June 22) pursung 'realist economics . . . at the cost, maybe, of popularity' (*The Times*, June 24)—and the rest of the familar chorus.

Perhaps as good an indication as any of the malevolently reactionary temper of the Tories was the proposal of a Tory M.P., on June 17 (which caused the turning of the Deakin worm mentioned above), that the Durham County Council, with its Labour majority, should be 'superseded', i.e. dismissed, and a controller put in its place, 'because of its policy on trade union membership'. That such ideas are no novelty in the Tory Party was shown by Sir Geoffrey Hutchinson, Q.C., M.P., and *chairman of the Tory national advisory committee on local government*, when he unfolded to the Ilford Rotary Club on June 23 an ingenious scheme for abolishing the L.C.C. with its huge Labour majority—by 'stepping up' existing borough authorities (many of them Tory) to 'something approximating to county borough status', and co-ordinating them 'on an upper level' by a Minister for London—who of course, would not be responsible to the citizens of London as is the L.C.C. Just as revealing, of course, is the wave of employers' rejections of union wage demands—too sudden not to have manifest Government backing—which began at the end of June (railwaymen, private bus employees, steel maintenance workers), backed by a wave of local lockouts, and dismissals of shop stewards. This course, leading to a head-on collision with the British working class, is what the 'rebellious and irritable' Tories would like; and the working-class movement would do well to begin its preparations against such a contingency.

Yet the fact remains that the irritations and the fissures in the Tory ranks are due precisely to the Government's realisation that the British working class is no longer what it was a generation ago, but more experienced, more strongly organised, with a larger leaven of politically conscious people in its midst. Hence Mr. Churchill's 'weak and vacillating' policy at home: hence *The Times*' dismissal of early denationalisation: hence the remarkable admission of the *Economist* (June 28) that 'many unions have a good case for more pay if they look purely at their sectional interest in maintaining their own members' real wages' : hence the even more remarkable contrast between the plea to the workers in the same issue of the *Economist*, that a 'temporary fall in real wages will help to get the country through its difficulties',

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the report of the *Sunday Times* next day that Churchill had promised the M.P.s to 'stabilise the cost of living'.

The fact is that the Tory Government is afraid of the growing anger of the workers: that the class it represents wants to attack the workers, come what may, just as it has accepted the yoke of the U.S.A., come what may: and that the resultant cleavages and fissures in the Tory Party not only threaten the present Government but — given its small majority in the House of Commons—the stability of the Tory majority itself. For who can believe that the Tory M.P.s would really be worried about the possibility of electoral defeat (as the *Sunday Times* admits) so soon after the General Election of October, 1951, if they really felt they could sit tight for another four or five years?

On the contrary, the inescapable lesson of the political situation in Britain is that the sturdy fight of the working class to disentangle itself from, and shake clear of, the network of illusions, half-truths and direct falsehoods in which it was enmeshed by the Attlee leadership during the years 1945-1951 has already sown fear, confusion and internal quarrel in the Tory ranks. The more the right-wing reactionaries, allies of the Tories, lose their grip, the more the Tories—spokesmen of British monopoly capitalism—feel alarmed. This is the moment, therefore, to push on more vigorously with the attack—in wage negotiations, on the housewives' cost of living and child care front, in the factories, in the field of education, against armaments and for negotiation as well as for a radical change in relations with the United States and for freedom to build East-West trade. The key to the unfolding political situation lies in the development of militancy in the trade union and labour movement and in a change of policy on the whole front. In proportion as these objects are achieved Tory 'confusion' can be turned into rout.

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL (2nd class): *To non-European countries (including Hongkong), except as below, post free: Single copy, 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription, 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy, 5s.; a year's subscription, 60s.

To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran and Syria, post free: Single copy, 4s.; a year's subscription, 48s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRENCH LESSONS: THE DUCLOS CASE

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

THE recent arrest and prosecution of Jacques Duclos, acting Secretary-General of the French Communist Party and Member of the French Parliament, followed by the annulment of the prosecution and his release after five weeks' imprisonment, present an illustrative sample of developments in France today—developments pretty well paralleled in most of Western Europe.

What is the background against which this insolent and so far abortive prosecution has been played out? Firstly, economic distress, already gravely affecting the people's living standards, and fast moving into deep depression. Then, the ever increasing clamour for war, coupled with ruinous expenditure on actual and on expected war. Then, more and more interference in the economic and political life of France by the clumsy and blatant imperialism of America, with all its consequences for the very independence of the country. And, as an accompaniment, there is a growing disregard for truth, decency, and even plausibility, in press propaganda, in legal proceedings, and indeed in every phase of the battle.

The other side of the background is the stout working-class resistance to these developments, and particularly to American domination and all its manifestations. The workers—once again the true patriots leading the resistance to the French enemies who prefer their class interests to their country's—are not merely resisting, but are seeing ever more clearly that there is really only one fight; whether they seek to defend peace, to re-establish French independence against the American occupants, to resist injustice, or to protect their living standards, they are fighting all the time the class struggle against their enemies and exploiters, external or internal, in defence of all their interests, at the same time as they stand in the forefront of the nation's struggle for independence and peace.

The Duclos prosecution displays a number of interesting features. In its lack of scruple and its disregard of the form and the substance of law, it shows a strong resemblance to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Leipzig prosecution of Dimitrov, to many other Nazi prosecutions, and above all to the prosecution of the French communist deputies in 1939. There are differences, of course. In 1939, a semi-Fascist government was prosecuting in the interests of the Nazis—its theoretical enemies; now, a similar government prosecutes on American orders (and gets money from the Americans which wasn't forthcoming from the Nazis). In 1939, they 'won' for a time; now, they have been prevented for the time, by the superior strength of the French working class and the socialist movement generally, from silencing their defiant and talented enemy.

What are the main facts of this illuminating story? Duclos, as a member of the French Assembly, was entitled to immunity both from arrest and from prosecution without the express authority of the Assembly, except in case of '*flagrant delict*', an exception limited to cases where the accused is found actually committing some clear and definite offence. Nevertheless, without any attempt to secure the permission of the Assembly, the police arrested Duclos about 10 p.m. on May 28, 1952, whilst he was travelling to his home in a car, accompanied by his wife, his chauffeur and his assistant chauffeur. The police knew who he was, and had obviously received instructions to arrest him. They made no accusation against him on the spot either of '*flagrant delict*' or anything else; but early on the following day they formulated a charge against him of carrying a weapon in the course of an illegal demonstration, and asserted that he had been arrested for this offence, as being in '*flagrant delict*'. This ridiculous charge, which survived for less than a day, was based on the fact that the chauffeur was carrying a revolver for which he had no permit, and that either he or the assistant chauffeur also had a rubber truncheon—very wise precautions in the light of the assaults made on Duclos in the past.

The accusation was utterly unfounded; not only had the police known nothing of any arms until after the arrest, but Duclos was not carrying any, nor is there anything in the vast dossier that has since accumulated around the case to show that he even knew of their existence. There had been, it is true, a demonstration on May 28, and it had been forbidden on American orders (although the prohibiton was probably illegal); but there was never any evidence that Duclos had even attended it. Although in the course of the fantastic and unscrupulous Government

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propaganda a 'Government spokesman' proclaimed to the Press that Duclos was the 'general' in command of the demonstration, no evidence that he had anything to do with either organising or controlling or even attending it ever reached the dossier of the examining magistrate. The demonstration had in any case finished two hours before the arrest (although, if the police were to be believed, one isolated incident ended only 1¼ hours before).

That should have been—and indeed, as we shall see, in one sense it was—the end of this accusation, or of any pretence of any justification for the arrest or prosecution of Duclos; but Government propaganda made great play at this early stage with two other 'charges' which, although never legally formulated, filled the columns of the newspapers. The first of these rested on two dead pigeons found wrapped in brown paper in the car. In the Press, and to some extent even in the dossier, these pigeons came to life in the car, and were carrier pigeons, designed to carry subversive messages on behalf of Duclos, presumably in connection with the demonstration which had ended —unattended by him—some time before; and they had been, it was suggested, stifled in the car rug at the moment of arrest. (A regulation passed by one of the abominable war-time French governments makes it an offence to have carrier pigeons without a licence.) The examining magistrate in due course had the pigeons scrutinised by a professor and four other experts, who established that the birds were not carrier pigeons, and were in fact too young to fly at all. In truth, they were intended for Duclos' supper, and had been given to him by one of his supporters. The other of these quasi-charges was that the car in which Duclos was riding was equipped with a wireless transmitter, no doubt to be used for similar purposes. This in its turn, on expert examination directed by the examining magistrate, turned out to be an ordinary receiving set, of a type to be found in thousands of cars; it was incapable of transmitting, and had not been modified in any way to render it 'subversively useful'.

So far, thus, there was a complete failure of any justification for the arrest or the prosecution; but on the evening of May 29 a new and more serious and even more unscrupulous effort was made to implicate Duclos and justify his arrest. The original charge was abandoned, and a new charge put forward of '*atteinte à la sureté interieure de l'Etat, et complicité.*' This is, roughly, a charge of 'plotting against the internal safety of the State', a sort

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of minor treason. It was introduced into French law at another ignoble period of history, having been first enacted by Napoleon III just after the coup d'état. It is now defined by Art. 87 of the penal code, which describes it as 'any attempt having the object of destroying or changing the government, or of inciting citizens or inhabitants to arm themselves against authority'. According to French legal authority, the offence cannot be made out without proof of the establishment of paramilitary formations, of preparations for civil war and of an intention to achieve a coup d'état.

This time, the prosecution had an infinitely greater burden than the one which they had just failed to discharge. Somehow, however dishonestly and insolently, and however grossly in disregard of the form and substance of the law, they had to try to make out not merely a prima facie case on this charge, but a case to justify arrest 'in *flagrant delict*'. One fatal difficulty was, of course, that Duclos had not been arrested on that charge, which had only been thought of late on the day after; another was that it is difficult to see how there could be *flagrant delict* of an offence of the vague nature of this *'atteinte à la sureté'* when all that Duclos was doing at the time of his arrest was to be riding home in a car with his wife and two chauffeurs. But the greatest difficulty for the prosecution lay in making out a case of any kind; for, so far as could be seen from the dossier as it existed even three weeks later, the new accusation rested on nothing more than the same facts, or lack of facts, as the earlier and far simpler charge of carrying arms! One may guess—and the dossier presented nothing more than a liberty to guess—that the demonstration already mentioned was supposed to form, somehow, the basis of this charge. But, apart altogether from the fact that there was still, even several weeks later, after all the prosecution's efforts to make out some sort of case, no evidence that Duclos had had any connection with organising or conducting the demonstration, there was nothing to suggest that the demonstration had anything whatever to do with civil war, coup d'état, plots against the State, or anything else save its specific and limited and lawful purpose of protesting against the arrival in France of General Ridgway, the American hero of napalm and germ warfare, who was coming to take up his post as Supreme Commander of the French, British, West German and other forces arrayed against the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Government, both in its propaganda and in its attempts to adduce evidence before the examining magistrate, had done its worst to find—or invent—something. The Minister of the Interior, M. Brune, had for example stated publicly that the new charge was based on documents found on Duclos, and had hinted that the documents might even justify prosecution for a plot against the 'exterior' safety of the State, which would justify trial before a military court; and the right-wing press had said that Duclos' brief-case was found to contain a map of Paris with all sorts of strongpoints marked on it. But the sober facts to be found in the dossier are that the only documents 'found on Duclos' were those in his brief-case; and even after the police had managed to steal the brief-case for a time—or, as they put it, to 'mislay it temporarily during the confusion'—nothing was found in it to incriminate Duclos in any way. (Some incompetent had, apparently, forgotten to slip the map in; but according to Duclos they had not forgotten to steal £30 which was in it when they 'mislaid' it.) Other efforts to bolster up the case consisted in a series of searches of Communist Party offices and private houses in Paris and in many different regions of France; but these in their turn yielded nothing.

Thus there was, and remained, no case; it was not even possible to be quite sure that the Government suggestion of a plot was related to the demonstration at all. Duclos, whose interrogation as appearing in the dossier frequently gives the impression that he was the accuser and the examining magistrate the accused, demanded:—'What *atteinte* have I committed? What act do you suggest that I have done? And to whom? And when? And where?' But no answer was ever forthcoming to those questions. The matter is made more ridiculous and disgraceful in that this charge of plotting was brought at the same time against André Stil, Editor of *L'Humanité,* jointly with Duclos. Stil had been arrested some days before May 28 on a charge of inciting to unlawful assembly; this charge was dropped when he was accused with Duclos. There was no mention of Stil in the dossier of Duclos, and thus no evidence that he and Duclos had plotted together. From the end of May until July 1, the investigation drifted along before the examining magistrate, with much valueless matter accumulating in the dossier, but there was still nothing to make a case against Duclos, let alone a justification for his arrest or prosecution without the permission of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Assembly. Lovers of justice and liberty, opponents of American domination and of Franco-American Fascism, and the general mass of French workers, waited anxiously to see whether some new and illegal insolence was being cooked up.

But a great—if not a final—victory in the Duclos case was drawing near. The growing power of working-class resistance and general indignation was too much even for this corrupt and cynical Government; and on July 1 a special Court re-examining the whole dossier, found itself compelled to declare that the arrest of Duclos was null and void because there was no evidence of his active participation or complicity in the demonstration, and no case of *flagrant delict.* The Court annulled the prosecution and released Duclos and the two chauffeurs (who had also been kept in arrest since May 28). André Stil, however, was kept in custody and the charges against him were not annulled.

This is a very great success for the forces of peace and progress, but there is much still to be done. The release of Stil has to be achieved, and that of dozens of ordinary people who took part in the demonstration. And Duclos must be safeguarded by popular pressure against the possibility that a political vote in the Assembly—child of a period of temporary degeneracy in French politics—may raise his immunity and permit the prosecution to try once again its unscrupulous tricks. But all the anti-American and anti-Fascist forces of Western Europe can take heart at this signal victory of the working-class forces, and can recall and echo for France and for themselves the words used by Thorez and Duclos in July, 1940:

'France will not become a sort of colonial country. . . . It is in the people that lie the great hopes of national and social liberation. . . . The French will never be an enslaved people.'

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first-class mail)); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPEECH AT PEKING

DR. HEWLETT JOHNSON

(The Dean of Canterbury)

[After a month's tour of China, the Dean of Canterbury addressed a meeting called by the China Peace Committee on July 1 in Peking. In this farewell speech, he mentioned for the first time how he came to bring home with him the appeal signed by all the leaders of the Chinese Christian churches protesting against germ warfare. It was his presentation of this protest to a press conference on his reaching England which was the sign for the hysterical campaign against him in press and parliament. —Ed., L.M.]

FRIENDS and comrades in the cause of peace, our hearts would be sad indeed at this parting did we not know that we are going forth doubly armed by all that we have seen and heard in your great country to carry on with our English comrades the battle in the West for the cause of peace. It was only through the extraordinary kindness and thoughtfulness with which you have made our journey easy and for the never-ending care of the dear team of comrades to whom you entrusted us that we could have carried through the wide programme of visits ranging from Canton to Mukden or Hangchow and Shanghai to Hankow and Shasi.

It has been a journey full of instruction and delight. At first hand we have learned the meaning of China's liberation: liberation from Japanese invasion and imperialist colonial domination. At first hand we have learned of the tiller of the land freed from feudal servitude and of the freedom of his wife and daughters which has enriched family life and multiplied the productive capacity of the land. We have grasped the truth, so significant for England, that for the first time in history there are 300 million farmers with money to spend and eager and willing to buy farm implements, small and large, which our engineers can supply and the fertilisers which our chemists can provide in exchange for the tung oil we so sadly need.

With what care and energy your Government aids the farmers and converts one of your age-long enemies into profitable servants of mankind. You tame your mighty rivers when in flood

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and make them irrigate your land during drought. I am well acquainted with the great engineering constructions of Russia and Eastern Europe, but I have never seen greater construction, considering the difficulties you have overcome, in speed and magnitude than that which, by water gates 1,000 metres long, you lead the turbulent Yangtze waters in flood safely to a huge storage area till the danger peak is past. By your excessive kindness in providing a special plane we were able to visit this enterprise on the very eve of its completion; when mingling with the workers we could see the industry and skill with which that vast multitude could work, the fiery enthusiasm which inspired them and the deep gratitude they feel to Chairman Mao, the great father of their land (and his comrades in office) for their timely rescue from the imminent peril from which he has saved them. My engineering eyes never felt more thrilled than when I looked along that 1,000 metre-long line of massive high-standing shield of gates completed within three months of its start (one of which was marked by torrents of rain). I can say the same, too, of that other mighty project which will render secure from the horror of the flood and famine, under which I found the Huai Valley groaning in 1932, and make it permanently the food bowl of China and the valley of happy and prosperous homes.

It is the people who have done it; working for the masses, the masses have worked for you to create these gigantic achievements.

Again, as one brought up in Lancashire in the midst of factories and mills, I viewed with intense interest the jute mill at Hangchow. Its great efficiency was most impressive, the Chinese improvements, a great advance on the English model; built so low that the workers do not feel hidden in an alley of machines, like a horse in blinkers; so psychologically right and all in line with the other amenities, gardens, dormitories and creches which make it the most beautiful factory I have ever seen. I learn with pleasure that China can be completely independent in other industries, if need be, as in jute, where she grows her own raw material without any diminution of food production, through more scientific agricultural food culture. I think sadly of the loss of trade which is caused by this forcing of China into fields of independent manufacture. But I learn with deep satisfaction that China desires no such independence, but would rather join with us in mutual and beneficial interchange of trade.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I observe with deep satisfaction the new cleanliness of China and the warfare against flies, mosquitoes, bugs and rats; signs of which we saw small and large everywhere. Canton brings water and lavatory accommodation to a quarter of a million people almost entirely without these amenities before. Tientsin is laying down 200 kilometres of sewage pipes. Changsha removes, by voluntary labour, a centuries-old rubbish heap of 12,000 tons and drives a large new road with ample modern drainage right through the squalid area of her town from station to riverside. Liberated China had started these vast sanitary enterprises before the blows of devilish germ warfare had begun. That warfare, however, met with scientific skill and indomitable courage, has given even greater impetus to this wave of sanitary reform and made China the most health-conscious nation in the world, a very pathfinder on the road to positive health.

I mention germ warfare last. With deepest shame, I learned of this appallingly inhuman deed; with still deeper shame that it is practiced by a nation which has the audacity to call itself 'Christian.' No one in China can have any doubt of the reality of this deed. None who has been, as I have been, on the very spots attacked and talked with eye-witnesses, has any doubt of the fact. But in England there is disbelief. It is impossible, I am told, that America could sink so low: 'These are Communist propaganda tales'.

Now it is just here that I take home with me from China my most powerful weapon in the cause of peace. For, quite deliberately, in every city I have visited, I have made contact with the leaders of the Christian churches; with bishops deriving their consecration from Canterbury, with Methodists, Baptists, priests and members of the Roman Catholic Church and many more. I conversed with them, interrogated them and with one voice I learned from them four things: religion is free in China; they cordially welcome the new life in China; they repudiate foreign control of China and Chinese Christianity; they are convinced of the reality of germ warfare and united with all China in the struggle against it while their own Christian doctors, nurses and laymen are involved in the struggle on Chinese as well as on Korean soil.

I bear home with me for laying before the Christian churches—my own and others—a series of the most widely signed documents by leaders of the Chinese Christian churches protesting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DESTINY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the series of lithographs by FRANS MASEREEL

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against germ warfare and calling on English Christians to join in the repudiation. No longer can Christians, and they still form the bulk of the population in my land, reject the germ stories as propaganda. Here indeed is a challenge they must meet, or they will drive a shocking wedge between Christian East and Christian West. I go back to England full of confidence and hope and thank you for placing this invaluable peace weapon in my hands.

I am at the end of what time permits me to say. Hours would be insufficient for what I wish to say. But I must add one word more in conclusion. I value your mighty constructions; I value your irrigation works and forest belts; I value your cleansed towns, your new industry and new agriculture. But on and beyond all these things, I value the mighty moral conversion which has gripped your whole people : a moral change which puts service to self last and service to brother man first; a moral change demanding of many an agonising struggle, not unrelated to that a true Christian feels as he yields to the call to devote his life to something higher than himself—and what can be higher than devotion to the human beings who surround us?

Here is the real clue to the mighty things that are happening all round me in China. Incarnated in your magnificent leader Chairman Mao and his devoted band of fellow leaders; incarnated in your gallant Red Army; incarnated everywhere and in every walk of life is this great spirit of each for all, with its corollary of all for each.

It is for that spirit that the ages have longed. It is that spirit that leads to peace. It is that spirit which is the full assurance of speedy and complete achievement.

THE APPEAL OF THE CHINESE PROTESTANTS

CHINA,

June 28, 1952.

Dear Dean and Mrs. Johnson,

You have been warmly welcome to New China as your arrival has symbolized that Chinese and English Christians are making united efforts to defend world peace.

We Christians of China would like to report to you an inhuman and anti-Christian crime recently committed by the American aggressors, which is the bacteriological warfare they have launched against the Chinese and the Korean people. Rev. Wang Tzu-chung of the Peking Congregational Church went to Korea and North-east China as a representative of the Chinese religious circles and saw with his own eyes the various germ-laden insects dropped by the U.S. armed forces as well as shells of containers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carrying insects. He collected with his own hands a great many evidences of the American bacteriological warfare. Many of our Christian doctors have witnessed the germ-disseminating insects and other carriers spread by the American aggressive forces, and taken active part in making every effort to defeat the American bacteriological warfare. We Chinese Christians confirm that the crimes of the bacteriological warfare committed by the American aggressors are irrefutable and undeniable.

Science should be used to cure people's diseases, but the American aggressors are making use of it in spreading diseases, and evils will certainly be punished by God and condemned by the people of the whole world. We Chinese Christians should like to ask you to tell our fellow Christians of Britain and America and those elsewhere in the whole world about our strong protest against the United States of America for her crime of launching the bacteriological warfare. For the sake of humanity, righteousness and world peace, we want to appeal to the Christians throughout the world to raise protest so as to put a stop to the atrocious deeds of the American aggressors in massacring Chinese and Korean peoples with bacteriological weapons.

God be with you! Wishing you a bon voyage.

Respectfully yours,

Y. T. Wu, Chairman, Christian Reform Committee; Liu Liang-Mo, Secretary, Christian Reform Committee; Robin Chen, Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Church of China; P. C. Lin, Secretary of the Anglican Church of China; Lindel Tseng, Presiding Bishop of the Anglican Church of China (retired); Tseng Chien-Heh, General Secretary, Central Office Anglican Church of China; Lin Hsien-Yang, Bishop, North China and Shantung, Anglican Communion; H. H. Tsin, General Secretary, Church of Christ in China; Tsai Chih-Chung, Secretary, Church of Christ in China; George Wu, Chairman of National Christian Council of China; Hsieh Yung-Ching, Chairman, Chinese Independent Church; Chih Ching-Tsai, Chairman, China Baptist Council; Ai Nien-San, Vice-Chairman, Lutheran Church; Mao Keh-Chung, Bishop of the Anglican Church; Chang Po-Huai, Secretary, Council of Christian Publishers; T. S. Yui, Secretary, China Christian Endeavour Union; Z. T. Kuang, Bishop Methodist Church; Kiang Chung-kwang, Vice-Chairman, Seventh Day Adventists; Ren Dah-ling, Secretary, China Baptist Publication Society; K. Y. Yang, Secretary, Chinese Home Missionary Society; Wu, Chi-Chung, President, China, Baptist Theological Seminary; Hsieh Shun-San, Congregational Church; Peter Wang, Chinese Independent Church; Cora Deng, General Secretary, National Committee Y.W.C.A.; Phoebe J. C. Shi, Secretary, National Committee, Y.W.C.A.; Li Shou-bao, Secretary, National Committee, Y.M.C.A.; K. H. Ting, General Secretary, Christian Literature Society; Pong Tze-kun, Chairman, Peking Church Federation; Chiang Yu-chang, Acting President, School of Religion, Yenching University; Wang Chin-hsin, Secretary, Methodist Church; Li Cheng-shen, President Peking Theological Seminary (Methodist); Wang Hua-ching, Bishop (retired), Methodist Church; Lin Fang, Major, Salvation Army, Peking; Ho Chin-te, Brigadier, Salvation Army, Peking; and 376 other signatures of pastors and lay leaders of Protestant churches and organisations from Peking, Shanghai and Tientsin.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON AN ARTICLE BY ENGELS

J. V. STALIN

[*On the occasion of the thirty-eighth anniversary of the outbreak of the first world war, we print this article by J. V. Stalin which is here published in English for the first time. This article, which is of exceptional importance for an understanding of the imperialist world war of 1914-18, was written as a letter to members of the political bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on July 19, 1934, and first published in the 'Bolshevik' No. 9. May, 1941.—Ed. L.M.*]

COMRADE Adoratsky proposes to print in the next number of *Bolshevik*, devoted to the 20th anniversary of the imperialist world war, the article by Engels entitled 'The Foreign Policy of Russian Tsardom' which was first published, abroad, in 1890. I should consider it a completely ordinary matter if it were proposed to print this article in a collection of Engels' works or in one of the historical journals. But the proposal is made to print it in our fighting journal *Bolshevik*, in the number devoted to the 20th anniversary of the imperialist world war. This means that those who make this proposal consider that the article in question can be regarded as an article which gives guidance, or which at least is profoundly instructive for our Party workers, in the matter of clarification of the problems of imperialism and of imperialist wars. But Engels' article, as is evident from its contents, is unfortunately lacking in these qualities, in spite of its merits. Moreover, it has a number of weaknesses of such a character that, if it were to be published without critical notes, it could mislead the reader.

Therefore I consider it inexpedient to publish Engels' article in the next number of *Bolshevik*.

What are the weaknesses to which I have referred?

1. Characterising the predatory policy of Russian Tsarism and correctly showing the abominable nature of this policy, Engels explains it not so much by the 'need' of the military-feudal-mercantile upper circles of Russia for outlets to the sea, seaports, for extending foreign trade and dominating strategic points, as by the circumstance that there stood at the head of Russia's foreign policy an all-powerful and very talented band

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of foreign adventurers, who succeeded everywhere and in everything, who in wonderful fashion managed to overcome each and every obstacle in the way of their adventurist purpose, who deceived with astonishing cleverness all the Governments of Europe and finally brought it about that Russia became a most powerful state, from the standpoint of military strength. Such a treatment of the question by Engels may seem highly improbable, but it is unfortunately a fact. Here are the relevant passages fom Engels' article:

> Foreign policy is unquestionably the side on which Tsardom is strong —very strong. Russian diplomacy forms, to a certain extent, a modern Order of Jesuits, powerful enough, if need be, to overcome even the whims of a Tsar, and to crush corruption within its own body, only to spread it the more plenteously abroad; an Order of Jesuits originally and by preference recruited from foreigners, Corsicans like Pozzo di Borgo, Germans like Nesselrode, Russo-Germans like Lieven, just as its founder, Catherine II, was a foreigner.
>
> Up to the present time, only one thoroughbred Russian, Gortchakov, has filled the highest post in this order, and his successor Von Giers again bears a foreign name.
>
> It is this secret order, originally recruited from foreign adventurers, which has raised the Russian Empire to its present power. With iron perseverance, gaze fixed resolutely on the goal, shrinking from no breach of faith, no treachery, no assassinations, no servility, lavishing bribes in all directions, made arrogant by no victory, discouraged by no defeat, stepping over the corpses of millions of soldiers and of, at least, one Tsar, this band, unscrupulous as talented, has done more than all the Russian armies to extend the frontiers of Russia from the Dnieper and Dvina to beyond the Vistula, to the Pruth, the Danube and the Black Sea; from the Don and Volga beyond the Caucasus and to the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes; to make Russia great, powerful and dreaded, and to open for her the road to the sovereignty of the world.

One might suppose that in Russia's external history it was diplomacy that achieved everything, while Tsars, feudalists, merchants and other social groups did nothing, or almost nothing.

One might suppose that if at the head of Russia's foreign policy there had stood, not foreign adventurers like Nesselrode or Von Giers, but Russian adventurers like Gortchakov and others, the foreign policy of Russia would have taken a different direction.

It is hardly necessary to mention that the policy of conquest, abominable and filthy as it was, was by no means a monopoly of the Russian Tsars. Everyone knows that a policy of conquest was then the policy, to no less a degree, if not to a greater, of all the rulers and diplomats of Europe, including such an Emperor of bourgeois background as Napoleon, who notwithstanding his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

non-Tsarist origin, practised in his foreign policy, also, intrigue and deceit, perfidy and flattery, brutality and bribery, murder and incendiarism.

Clearly, matters could not be otherwise.

It is evident that in writing his pamphlet against Russian Tsardom (Engels' article is a good fighting pamphlet), Engels was a little carried away, and, being carried away, forgot for a short time certain elementary things which were well known to him.

2. Characterising the situation in Europe and expounding the causes and prospects of the approaching world war, Engels writes:

> The European situation today is governed by three facts: (1) the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany; (2) the impending advance of Russian Tsardom upon Constantinople; (3) the struggle in all countries, ever growing fiercer, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the working-class and the middle-class, a struggle whose thermometer is the everywhere advancing socialist movement.
>
> The two first (facts) necessitate the grouping of Europe, today, into two large camps. The German annexation makes France the ally of Russia against Germany; the threatening of Constantinople by Tsardom makes Austria and even Italy the allies of Germany. Both camps are preparing for a decisive battle, for a war such as the world has not yet seen, in which 10 to 15 million armed combatants will stand face to face. Only two circumstances have thus far prevented the outbreak of this fearful war: first, the incredibly rapid improvements in firearms, in consequence of which every newly-invented arm is already superseded by a new invention, before it can be introduced into even *one* army; and secondly, the absolute impossibility of calculating the chances, the complete uncertainty as to who will finally come out victor from this gigantic struggle.
>
> All this danger of a general war will disappear on the day when a change of things in Russia will allow the Russian people to blot out, at a stroke, the traditional policy of conquest of its Tsars, and to turn its attention to its own internal vital interests, now seriously menaced, instead of dreaming about universal supremacy.
>
> . . . a Russian National Assembly, in order to settle only the most pressing internal difficulties, would at once have to put a decided stop to all hankering after new conquests.
>
> Europe is gliding down an inclined plane with increasing swiftness towards the abyss of a general war, a war of hitherto unheard-of extent and ferocity. Only one thing can stop it—a change of system in Russia. That this must come about in a few years there can be no doubt.
>
> On that day when Tsardom falls—this last stronghold of the whole European reaction—on that day a quite different wind will blow across Europe.

It is impossible not to observe that in this characterisation of the situation in Europe and summary of the causes leading to-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards world war, Engels omits one important factor, which later on played the most decisive part, namely, the factor of *imperialist* struggle for colonies, for markets, for sources of raw material. This had very serious importance already at that time. He omits the role of Great Britain as a factor in the coming world war, the factor of the contradictions between Germany and Great Britain, contradictions which were already of serious importance and which later on played almost the determining part in the beginning and development of the world war.

I think that this omission constitutes the principal weakness in Engels' article. From this weakness there ensue the remaining weaknesses of the article, of which the following are noteworthy:—

(a) Overestimation of the role of Tsarist Russia's striving towards Constantinople in connection with the maturing of the world war. True, Engels mentions first as a war factor the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany, but thereafter he removes this factor into the background and brings to the forefront the predatory strivings of Russian Tsardom, asserting that *'all this danger of general war will disappear on the day* when a change of things in Russia will allow the Russian people to blot out, at a stroke, the traditional policy of conquest of its Tsars.'

This is certainly an exaggeration.

(b) Overestimation of the role of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, the role of the 'Russian national assembly' (bourgeois Parliament) in relation to averting the approaching world war. Engels asserts that the downfall of Russian Tsarism is the only means of averting world war. This is a plain exaggeration. A new, bourgeois order in Russia, with its 'national assembly', could not avert war if only because the principal sources of war lay in the increasing intensity of imperialist struggle between the main imperialist powers. The fact is that from the time of Russia's defeat in the Crimea in the 'fifties of last century the independent role of Tsarism in the sphere of European foreign policy began to wane to a significant extent, and that as a factor in the imperialist world conflict Tsarist Russia served essentially as an auxiliary reserve for the principal powers of Europe.

(c) Overestimation of the role of the Tsarist power as the '*last* stronghold of the whole European reaction'. That the Tsarist power in Russia was a mighty stronghold of all-European (and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also Asiatic) reaction there can be no doubt. But that it was the *last* stronghold of this reaction one can legitimately doubt.

It is necessary to note that these weaknesses of Engels' article are not only of 'historical value'. They have, or can have, a most serious practical importance. Truly, *if* imperialist struggle for colonies and spheres of influence is lost sight of, as a factor in the approaching world war; *if* the imperialist contradictions between England and Germany are forgotten; *if* the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany is withdrawn from the foreground as a war factor in favour of Russian Tsardom's striving towards Constantinople, considered as the more serious and determining factor; *if*, finally, Russian Tsardom represents the last rampart of all-European reaction—then is it not clear that a war, let us say, of bourgeois Germany against Tsarist Russia is not an imperialist war, not a robber war, not an anti-popular war, but a war of liberation, or almost of liberation?

One can hardly doubt that this way of thinking facilitated the sin of the German Social-Democrats on August 4, 1914, when they decided to vote for war credits and proclaimed the slogan of defence of the bourgeois Fatherland against Tsarist Russia, against 'Russian barbarism' and so on.

It is characteristic that in his letters to Bebel written in 1891, a year after the publication of this article, when he deals with the prospects of the coming war, Engels says directly that 'the victory of Germany is, therefore, the victory of the revolution', that 'if Russia starts war, then—forward against the Russians and their allies, whoever they may be!' (*)

It is obvious that such a way of thinking allows no place for revolutionary defeatism, for Lenin's policy of transforming imperialist war into civil war.

That is how matters stand as regards the weaknesses in Engels' article.

Evidently Engels, alarmed by the Franco-Russian alliance which was then (1890-91) being formed, with its edge directed against the Austro-German coalition, set himself the task of attacking Russia's foreign policy in this article so as to deprive it of all credit in the eyes of European public opinion, and especially British public opinion; but in carrying out this task he lost sight of a number of other very important and even determining

*Cf. article printed in Labour Monthly, August 1931.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factors, with the result that he fell into the one-sidedness which we have revealed.

After all this, is it appropriate to print Engels' article in our fighting organ *Bolshevik*, as an article which provides guidance or which in any case is profoundly instructive—because it is clear that to print it in *Bolshevik* would mean to give it, tacitly, such a recommendation?

I think that it is not appropriate.

SOUTH AFRICAN FASCISM

MOSES KOTANE*

THE crisis into which the Government has plunged South Africa affects every section of the people, every aspect of our lives. In this crisis, the Nationalist Party has dropped the mask with which they have attempted to deceive the public during their first four years of office, the mask of respect for the law and democratic institutions. Faced with the mounting hatred and opposition of the people against their ruinous policies they have embarked upon one act after another of reckless tyranny. They are obsessed with a desire to retain state power at all costs. They want this power so that they can establish a so-called republic, ruled by the Broederbond. In the interests of a section of Afrikaans financiers and big farmers they seek to lower the standard of all workers, including large sections of the Afrikaans people, and to reduce the status of the Non-European labourer still further. They envisage an imperialist policy of territorial expansion designed to impose *apartheid* and Nationalist domination over Southern and ultimately Central Africa.

Two years ago, the Nationalist Government, taking advantage of international anti-communist war-hysteria whipped up by American reaction forced the Suppression of Communism Act through Parliament. Today they are making use of the unlimited despotic powers placed in their hands by this evil law to destroy one liberty after another. They have started with *The Guardian;* with elected representatives Kahn and Carneson; with national leaders like Dadoo, Marks and Kotane; with trade unionists like Sachs, Wolfson and Du-Plessis; with peace workers like Harmel.

*Moses Kotane, who was secretary of the South African Communist Party until its recent dissolution, is a leading member of the African National Congress. His statement first appeared in the Cape Town *Clarion*, June 19, 1952.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have attempted to present these attacks on civil liberties as though they were moves against communism alone. But their attempt has failed. The people have not been deceived. The people have been roused by these actions to vigorous resistance. On every front vocal and determined opposition is rising. Proscribed leaders are refusing to submit to Swart's arbitrary orders. Backed by their members and public opinion, their defiance fans the flames of this opposition. It is widely understood that though it is *The Guardian* which is suppressed today, tomorrow it will be the Rand *Daily Mail*, the Cape *Argus* or the Natal *Mercury;* that if Malan can disregard the electorate and expel Kahn from parliament, he can expel other opposition members; that the Government's objective is not the removal of individuals but the destruction of the national and trade union movements themselves and freedom to organise.

The fact is that the Nationalist Government is out to attain complete and unrestricted power. They will not be checked by any legal or moral considerations. They will smash down any and every obstacle in their path to dictatorship unless the people's opposition prevents them. They were solemnly pledged to uphold the entrenched clauses of the constitution. They violated their pledge. They scrapped the Coloured vote. They repudiated the verdict of the Courts and declared the Nationalist Party caucus to be the highest Court in the land. Such men do not tolerate any limitation to their authority.

Many opponents of the Government are pinning their hope on a Nationalist defeat in the 1953 General Election. They do not perceive the vital point. While they are perfecting their electoral machinery for 1953, the Government is making preparations for a coup d'etat to ensure that it will not be shifted by the democratic process. Unless the combined opposition of the people is able now to defeat the first steps to dictatorship, the Government, fearing the outcome of a straight election, will use its sweeping powers to frustrate the people's will. It will manipulate constituencies and voting rights and debar candidates. Or it will stage a Nazi 'Ja-election', with a background of hysteria and monstrous lies, where it is called treason to vote against the Nationalists and armed police supervise the voting. Or, declaring a 'national emergency', and with the 'legal' sanction of their majority, they will suspend the election indefinitely.

This is not far-fetched. These are the men who have loaded the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South-West African German vote to increase their majority. They have expelled an elected M.P. They have guillotined every important debate. They have passed law after law giving despotic powers to Ministers to issue regulations, orders and notices and to rule by decree. They have demonstrated their contempt for Parliament, law and democratic institutions.

These men are fascists. They will not be deterred by the timid and compromising policy which Mr. Strauss set forth in his recent Paari speech. The United Party leader praised some of Malan's most hateful and reactionary *apartheid* legislation; he accepted in principle the vicious anti-Communist law; he undertook only to repeal portions of the Citizenship Act affecting British settlers in South Africa. Such a policy can serve only to buttress the Nationalist Government and bitterly to disappoint and dishearten millions of democrats, both European and non-European. This policy cannot even succeed in its apparent purpose of enticing prejudiced plattelanders from the Nationalists. The Strydons can always outdo the Strausses at racial propaganda. The country wanted to hear from Mr. Strauss a fighting democratic programme designed to rouse to action the masses of the workers, the struggling farmers and the middle classes. Appeasement and timidity will not avail.

Another factor which weakens the people's resistance to Nationalist tyranny is the acceptance by the Parliamentary opposition leaders of the Government's foreign policy. The Nationalists need a war atmosphere, just as Hitler used German war-fever to consolidate large sections of the German nation behind him. The Nationalist Government is one of the most enthusiastic followers of the adventurous American war-policy. The same Nationalist Party which in the last war wished to remain neutral and opposed the sending of troops outside the Union, now hastens to send airmen to a faraway corner of the earth to drop napalm bombs on Korea peasants who have done us no injury whatsoever. The Nationalist Party which claims to be the heir to the Boer tradition of independence has committed South Africa in advance to the Middle East Pact—a weapon against Arab independence. The fight for democracy in South Africa cannot be divorced from the struggle for world peace. The Nationalists can only be stopped and defeated by the determined, active resistance of the people—all the people—on every front, against every attack, on every issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a fundamental error to imagine that the basic political problems of South Africa can be solved without the participation of the great Non-European majority of our people. When the Torch Commando says that the constitutional issue is a matter for Europeans only, they overlook not merely the simple fact that the issue arises from the Coloured people's franchise, but also that the constitutional future of South Africa is of equal concern to every citizen, white and black. It is because the vote was confined almost exclusively to Europeans that the Malan Government is today in office and that democracy is imperilled. The fruits of the 1948 General Election prove that democracy can only survive in South Africa if the great mass of Non-Europeans are brought actively into the struggle against fascism.

Already the African and Indian Congresses have embarked upon a major campaign for the defiance of unjust laws, for the defeat of the Government's plan to enslave South Africa. Malan tries to depict this campaign as a menace to 'law and order' and to the European people. Far from it. The campaign, vigorously and militantly pursued, can be a major contribution to defeating Government lawlessness and establishing peaceful and harmonious relations among the people of South Africa. The Congress leaders are not anti-white. They have repeatedly declared their willingness to work in friendship and co-operation with all democratic Europeans, against fascism and for the building of a free and happy South Africa. Such co-operation, however, can only be based on the recognition of the Non-Europeans' vital interests as citizens in all matters affecting the country's well-being, not upon the Nationalists concept of the master race and Non-European servitude. Seen in their true perspective the two Congresses are major constituents of that broad democratic alliance of all anti-fascist South Africans which must be brought into being if the Nazi menace is to be met and defeated.

Another essential factor in such a people's front of resistance is an active, live trade union movement, campaigning with fearless determination in the defence of the living standards and liberties of the workers. The task is not predominantly one of attaining a formal 'unity' of registered trade unions from above but also one of creating a practical unity of workers in every industry, based on their common needs for jobs, higher wages and security. A new spirit is needed. There is a lesson to be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learnt by all trade union, Congress and democratic leaders and organisations from the promptitude, drive and imagination displayed by the Garment Workers' Union in answer to the Government's attack on Mr. Sachs. Imbued with such a spirit the trade union movement can rally thousands of workers in the vanguard of the anti-fascist struggle.

The true united democratic front of the South African people should not be envisaged solely as a formal coalition or electoral alliance, but as a common front arising out of the practical, effective campaigns and struggles, whether conducted separately or in combination of all the diverse elements opposed to the Government. The United Party must play its part in the common struggle: but to be of real value it must rid itself of the policy of appeasement, and measure up to the needs of the present crisis. The Labour Party, too, can fulfil a vital need if, following in the tradition of the world labour movement, it ceases to restrict itself to parliamentary debate and sets out to mobilise the mass of the European workers for resistance to tyranny. There are the ex-servicemen's organisations such as the Torch Commando and the Springbok Legion, consisting of men and women who not long ago took up arms to defeat a Nazi attack from abroad. There are the churches, business and professional organisations, the multifarious local vigilance, tenants, civic, educational, patriotic and sectional bodies. All must be drawn into the broad alliance of the people of South Africa against the Malanazi menace, every section of the population, every democratic group.

This struggle is not merely a party dispute of a petty political wrangle. It is the fundamental question of the future of our country, whether we are to live in freedom or slavery. Every organisation and every individual is affected by this crisis and must be won for active participation in the people's front. No one dare stand aside. It is possible—indeed essential for these diverse elements to combat the Nationalists with all their strength. In the course of this common struggle will develop mutual understanding and a common policy acceptable to all sections and capable of arousing the enthusiasm of the overwhelming majority of the people.

The great weaknesses of the so-called 'United Democratic Front' of the United Party, Labour and Torch Commando are its narrow, exclusively electoral basis and its lack of a fighting policy. Today's fight is not merely of canvassing voters and bringing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them to the ballot box; it is also a struggle to preserve the institution of the ballot box against Government by storm-troopers and lawlessness. Such a struggle calls for courage, sacrifice and endurance. The people of South Africa are not lacking in these qualities. But they will not be mobilised for the hardships and dangers, nor inspired for the struggle by the policies of the last United Party administration, dominated by vested interests and characterised by a disregard for the needs of the common people.

South Africa needs a people's policy, acceptable to the widest section of the population, serving to fire their minds and hearts with the vision of that better South Africa which is within our grasp. Such a policy, common to all sections of the anti-Nationalist front is not to be attained by the academic drafting of paper Utopias; it can only emerge in the course of the practical struggle before us. But assuredly, it must envisage something more positive than the pre-1948 administration, which paved the way for the accession of the Nationalists at the last election. It must envisage the replacement of the Nationalist Government by a truly popular coalition of all democratic forces in our country; a government of democratic reform capable of ensuring political and economic advancement and forever abolishing the conditions of oppression, ignorance and poverty which have bred Malanism.

The iniquitous *apartheid* legislation of the past four years must be swept away, together with the structure of despotism built up by the Malanites and founded on the Suppression of Communism and High Court of Parliament Acts. Freedom of speech, of the press, of organisation and movement must be proclaimed and secured. The repression of the African, Coloured and Indian people—which poisons race relations, hampers the country's development and blackens South Africa's reputation throughout the world—must be ended. Pass-laws, ghettos, farm gaols must go. Non-Europeans must get the opportunities to acquire education, skill, professional training, land-ownership rights and commercial facilities. Their exercise of such opportunities can vastly advance the prosperity of the country as a whole. Democracy in South Africa can never be secure until its basis is broadened and extended to Non-Europeans. Franchise rights must be extended. The loading of constituencies in rural areas and South West Africa must be abolished.

Democratic South Africa must repudiate the aggressive foreign policy of the Nationalists which has set most of the world against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. We have no right to interfere with the Protectorates. We must seek peace with our neighbours and throughout the world; the settlement of international disputes through negotiation; a break with American aggression. Above all, the simple economic needs of the people must receive urgent attention. Wages must be raised; the crazy rise in prices firmly curbed. Food, homes, land and jobs for all are the cornerstone of a stable democracy. These are the goals which can inspire and arouse the people for the arduous days ahead. Immediately there is the urgent and vital task before all of us to resist the onslaughts which are being daily made upon the people's rights. It is the solemn duty of every consistent democrat in these stormy days to join wholeheartedly in these battles. The ban on the *Guardian* must be lifted. Mr. Swart's attempt to silence trade unionists, Congressmen, workers for peace, must be stopped. Sam Kahn and Fred Carneson must be restored to the positions to which they were elected.

It is the solemn duty of every consistent democrat to join wholeheartedly in the fight to save South Africa. Everyone, whatever his or her nationality, has a task to perform; organisations to work in; an example to set. Whether it be in the vanguard of Congress volunteers, in the trade union movement, the people's organisations for peace or democracy, the truly advanced and democratic South African will prove himself in times like these by his energy and devotion, his refusal to submit to depotism, his readiness to sacrifice personal interests, his efforts to raise the spirit and the level of political understanding of those about him. Given enough such men and women, the defeat of the Nationalists is certain. Their savage acts of tyranny and revenge are signs not of strength, but of fear and desperation. Their days are numbered; the victory of the forces of freedom in our times is assured. The people are on the march.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A LETTER TO THE QUEEN

[*In the year of the 150th Anniversary of the birth of Victor Hugo, we print the following declaration from the exiles of Jersey (where Victor Hugo was then in exile) with reference to the state visit of Queen Victoria to Napoleon III, the rascally adventurer to whom Marx meted out an immortality of infamy in 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.' This state visit took place during the Crimean War when Britain, France, Turkey, etc., were in alliance against Tsarist Russia. This declaration of the Jersey exiles was translated by Ernest Jones and published in the Chartist* People's Paper. *Today in the Isle of Guernsey the rugged monument to Hugo stands in contemptuous juxtaposition to the formal statue of Victoria.—Ed., L.M.*]

TO THE QUEEN OF ENGLAND

MADAM:—In return for the hospitality the laws of your country have afforded us, permit us to address to you a few useful reflections on your recent voyage . . .

Voyage and visits, promenades and parades, receptions and ovations, balls, illuminations, banquets, concerts, theatres, addresses, puns, fireworks—everything went on as well as could be wished, from the weather, which took care to be fine and French (flattering attention for an Englishwoman), to the very Russians, who were obliging enough to let themselves be beaten on the Tchernaya and furnished the *Moniteur* with the gay jest: '*Victoria* comes, and *Victory* as well.' This is all delightful. You have visited Paris, breakfasted at St. Cloud, and dined at the Tuileries, supped at the Trianon, and lunched everywhere. You have danced at the Hotel de Ville, re-danced at Versailles, wept at the Invalides, and laughed at St. Germain. You have baptized a street, as genius or glory have done ere this . . . You have reviewed the cream of society: the army, magistrates, church, bank, the ladies of the 'Halle,' all the peas-blossom of the Empire, all its civil and military nobility, its peace and its war, its politics, eloquence, virtue, valour, good faith, wit, grace, and *police*. And all this fine world came in its best, decorated, scented and decked, to greet the 'friend of the family.' You have admired the works of industry, the masterpieces of art, the wonders of the exhibition, our curiosities, our miracles—our 'seven prodigies' . . . in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fine, the Flora and Fauna of the Empire, all that deserves to be contemplated, noted or exposed.

You have been kissed at the knee—below the garter says *The Times*—by thirty Arab chiefs. *Honi soit qui mal y pense!* You have been kissed on the hand by the Emperor. God save the Queen! You have been saluted by all the cannon of Vincennes, and awakened by 500 tambours wishing good morrow to your princely half. The nightingales of the *guides*, and the linnets of the opera, have sung you the chant of royalty, and the people did *not* sing 'Malbrook.' The Mayor of Amiens regaled you with his harangues and patties; Chevet supplied you with every dish he knew. The censers of the press burnt their richest perfume for you; M. Hausman *(Prefect of the Seine)* his fattest lamp oil. You threw Canrobert into the 'Bath,' drank champagne, and embraced Jerome.

It was too much. Then, at the height of happiness, you, like Augustus, sighed to descend. You wished to fly for a little while from all of these great men and fine things; and one morning, not the least pleasant of them all, fatigued, cloyed with admiration and delight, swayed by a truthful, natural, human impulse, you went, not as a queen, but as a woman, a daughter of Eve, a feeble mortal, a simple citizen, an honest housewife of Windsor, after a quiet meal, without saying a word to Pietri *(chief of police)*, you drove off with your husband and without ceremony, repaired to the Jardin des Plantes, under the trees and amid the wild beasts of the good God.

Thus, nothing was wanting at this festivity. It is well: you can now, if ever, understand the song of the poor Queen Mary, 'Adieu, thou pleasant realm of France'. It is well: once more we congratulate you. Now, listen to our observations.

Now that the wreaths are faded and the lights extinguished, the fireworks exploded and the *bon-bons* eaten; now that you are once more refreshed and at home; now that you have regained the evenness of your temper and your sense, let us reason together, if you please. What was the object of your journey? for Queens do not travel like other people, merely for pleasure's sake even in France.

What did you go to that man for?

Certainly you, a child of Pitt and wife of Cobourg, never went to see a Bonaparte. Certainly, you, as excellent a woman as ever

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

queen can be, did not go to see the ruffian of the Haymarket. Certainly, you, a constitutional monarch, never went to see an upstart tyrant. You, parliamentary sovereign, never went to see a maker of *coups d'état.*

What for, then, did you mount that ill-omened gallery?

You went to see an ally. That is a reason. It needed something as cogent as this, such a great reason, such a state motive, such an alliance, in fine, to surmount your natural antipathies, your legitimate repugnance, your scorn for, and even horror of, such a host, to force you to receive him in your house, then to visit him in his, to put your hand in his, your cheek on his *(Napoleon kissed the Queen on both cheeks when he received her),* to exchange your blue riband for his red one, your garter for his necktie, to treat him as an equal, as a brother is treated by a sister, as an Emperor is treated by a Queen— official proceedings, political politeness, we know, which commit to nothing personally, which pledge no friendship or esteem, we grant it, but which, enacted with such a being, outrage morality, and stain the conscience; yes, you sacrificed all—queenly dignity, feminine scruples, aristocratic pride, English feeling, rank, race, sex, all, even the sense of modesty, for the sake of that great ally . . .

And this ally, Madam! Have those who are personally responsible for your acts, have your ministers, considered on what rotten plank they made you place your foot? Is he a safe ally? Safe as the sand, the wind, the ice—as all that fleets, melts, and changes. He is—you know it well—the word of treachery made flesh, the incarnation of perjury, the soul of Judas in the skin of Jarnac.* In a word, the nightman of the 2nd of December. As Queen, you must read the papers and hear the news—those of yesterday, at least. Therefore, you know the man. You know him by his works. Do you know how he acted towards the friends of order? Peace, pact, treaty, association, alliance, union, the street Poictiers, then the Roman expedition, the law of May 31; all aimed, he said, at the machinations of royalty against the Republic. Then, one day—no, one night!—quite at his ease, he stabs, after he has cheated, overturns friends and foes, and raises the empire over the head of royalty and republic alike. But, Madam, he has not yet the empire he desires. The Rhine disturbs

* A famous knight of France, who struck his enemy by stealth in a part of the body not allowed to be assailed by the laws of chivalry, and whose blow has been synonymous with treachery.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his digestion, and the Alps give him the heartburn. He will gnaw at them, bite at them, be sure. He calls them his property, and, as he cannot take them by force at once, he will try ruse, and wait results. It is always the same game with him. He don't know two tricks in the cards. He imitates others too well not to imitate himself, especially when he succeeds. Have a care! . . .

Under the plea of 'Order', and 'Moderation', he has tied you to himself, and made you break with your brethren of the Holy Alliance. He has destroyed your army, and caused you to require foreign legions. He has destroyed your *prestige*, disordered your constitutional housekeeping, troubled your parliamentary interior, demoralised your oligarchy and agitated your people, which demands a reform savouring of revolution. He has done you more harm than a landing at Hastings would have done. He has vanquished you, more than the Russians. He treats you as a vassal, even now. He pretends that he went to give his orders, and that you went to receive them. When he considers you sufficiently weakened, sufficiently involved at home and abroad, he will make his European *coup d'état*. 'Europe', said his uncle, 'will be Cossack or Republican'. 'Neither one nor the other', says the nephew; 'it shall be Bonapartist'; and he will Decembrise you if he has time.

That is what comes of having such an ally, of having embarked with this felon in a war void of principle and plan—having no aim but his egotism. For, be it said in confidence, you, Madam, have no higher principle in view than he, in this wretched eastern war. If he is prompted by ambition, you are instigated by self-interest; you fight for the shop as he does for the empire; you fear for India as he sighs for Italy. You do exactly at Madras what he does at Rome, what you don't wish the Czar to do at Constantinople, and what the Sultan does there notwithstanding. For you are all Czars together—more or less—the Czar of France, with Cayenne for his Siberia, you Czarina of the Indies, with Ireland for your Poland; and your war is merely a war of rival Czars, a modern Thebaid, an absurd, pagan war—an anachronism that frights the age like an unnatural prodigy, and scandalises it like an outrage; a war that recalls the middle ages, and plunges us once more in barbarian times, invasions, war for conquest-sake—war without energy and without end, the war of dogs for a disputed bone.

You, a woman, a Christian, a mother, an English Queen, defend

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the cost of 20,000 mourning mothers, whose sons have been given for taking a piece of an old wall—at the expense of devastation, arson, rape, violation, carnage, butchery and murder—at this cost, we say, you defend the Crescent, the Koran, harems, polygamy, eunuchs, the cord, mutes, barbarism and death—Turkey, in fine, which oppresses millions of Greeks, and robbed them of country, independence, nationality, and right; and the oppression exercised by this galvanised corpse, you support in the name of life, progress, humanity and civilisation! . . . The Greeks, ever weak under a monarchy, have ever been strong under a Republic.

But why speak of Republics to a Queen? Let us return to your ally. We have said he will betray you, if he has the time. We hope he will not have the time. Is he, in fact, very safe?

There are crimes that permit of no pardon—that allow of no repentance and no remission. The conscience of man symbolised this in its conception of hell. The Lamb-God, Christ the Saviour, prayed for his executioners, and cried from the Cross : 'Forgive them, Father! for they know not what they do'. But for those *who do know*, for those, like Tiberius and Caiphas, the same Christ reserved supreme justice, announced the day of inflexible judgement, pronounced the eternal sentence, 'Go! ye accursed!' Scripture says this. Reason corroborates Scripture.

The people, that other crucified, is also good and just. It remits what may be remitted, but enacts what should be enacted. Do not reckon on its clemency for your ally. He is one of the executioners *who knows what he does.* He is without remorse: be he without hope as he shall be without pardon. He will be punished.

His uncle, at least, fought for the Republic, gained victories for it, beat banded kings in its name, and, at any rate, never received the Republic in his safe-keeping, never swore to its preservation. But this man has surpassed his model—knowingly, willingly assassinated the liberty of the people, and stolen on it like a midnight robber. This man has no Alps, no Pyramids, to point to; he has only Boulogne, Strasbourg and Savoy. This man, with the kiss of Judas, and greater crime than Cain—for he, sworn guardian of the Republic, cannot even say 'am I my brother's keeper'?—this man, what does he merit? So great was the crime of usurpation of a people's rights, that France looked on quietly when banded kings took Napoleon I to St. Helena. Be tranquil, this man will never be taken to St. Helena. France will not let

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him go, she will not let him be taken away, she will not leave his punishment to others, she will strike him with her own hand. He will be punished . . .

He represent France! He, the Corsican, coupled with the Spaniard, and purpled with the blood of Frenchmen! Ah! Do not act so unjustly towards France, do not so libel that Promethus, as to suppose it represented by its vulture. That French people is not inferior to your own, and had it, like yours, a little liberty, were it not weighted down beneath a mass of steel, it would already have hurled the monster off its breast. But consider it as an accomplished fact. It is merely a question of time. The past answers for the future. Paris is the metropolis of Revolution, as well at that of France.

The Revolution, with your permission, will point out to you its places worthy of note. Your ally has made you pass under triumphal arches in every street where his victims fell; under flags hung from every house riddled by his cannon-balls; on flowery carpets covering the pools of his massacres—between two rows of mercenaries and spies, crying alternately, 'Long live the Queen!' 'Long live the Emperor!' The voice of blood is louder than that of police sergeants; the odour of blood is stronger than that of flower-wreaths; the colour of blood is redder than that of banners. You cannot take a step in Paris, without reading his sentence written in blood. Every paving-stone cries 'Murder!' and every murder cries 'Vengeance!' Not a stone, from end to end of Paris, that does not accuse him, condemn him—that will not rise one day to execute him . . .

And when shall this be? We need not be sorcerers to foretell the time. Justice may walk or halt, but still she comes; on stilts or crutches, still she comes. She is even nearer than you think. The accursed one has called himself the elect of Providence; blasphemy as it is to God we recognise him as such, and admirably has he fulfilled his mission. He has melted down the column, lost the star, broken the charm, dissipated the old victories, consumed the whole legacy—hat, coat, boots, and all. He has killed for ever in the public mind the name of the empire and the emperor. He has killed with the same blow his accomplices—army, clergy, magistracy, usury—all the old world. He has even killed the two greatest enemies of revolution—the British aristocracy and the Russian autocracy, the gold and the steel of the old coalition. Unconsciously he has furthered the work of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

God and freedom. And now his comet wanes. Scarcely was your back turned, Madam, but strange sounds and lights dived up. The people knew its duty towards a woman and a guest—but scarce had you gone before attempts and insurrections flicker forth all around. Abroad, his soldiers of the Emperor became soldiers of the Republic, and dying, forgot to cry 'Caesar!' in gasping the 'Marseillaise'. . .

Well, then, he trembles; for he believed in the peasantry. This time it is not the ghosts of Cayenne, the fugitives of Belle Isle, the republicans, the reds, the socialists who return. No! this time it is the peasantry. Yes! the peasants of December—the peasants that elected him—whom he deceived, but whom he will deceive no more. Ah! Belshazzar, the finger is on the wall.

Pray God, Madam, that he may have as strong a heart to bear death as he had to inflict it. The peasants murmur, the peasants are angered, the peasants cry, 'Down with the Emperor! Long live the Marianne! *(secret revolutionary organisation)* Long live the democratic social and universal Republic!'

After those who signed the above address were expelled from Jersey by a violation of all law (for, we repeat, had they been guilty of any offence, they ought to have been tried by the laws of the country), thirty-four of the remaining exiles issued the following Declaration . . .

[*The text, not given here, is a further denunciation of Bonaparte. Victor Hugo heads the list of signatures. The Chartist* Peoples's Paper *continues:*]

Shortly after issue of the above, all those who signed it were expelled from Jersey by *Martial Law*. An illustrious Pole, Swietoslawski, at once published his adherence to the declaration. Victor Hugo, the greatest poet, orator, dramatist and novelist of the age, is among the expelled, and the entire act is a violation of English law. If the proscribed were guilty of an offence, then we say, try them by law and *punish* them. As it is, England is being branded with infamy in the eyes of the world. Men whose illustrious names will live when those who expelled them will have been forgotten for centuries, are being driven from their asylum at the bidding of the most infamous of foreign despots. If the English people cannot vindicate their own laws—if they are to be set aside to please the whim of any perjurer and assassin who, clothed with a little power for a day, chooses to issue his mandates to us—then farewell for ever to anything like honour or respect for Englishmen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Review

KOREA

The Hidden History of the Korean War, by I. F. Stone. (364 pp. Turnstile Press. *21s.*)

Two years have passed since the American-inspired aggression in Korea and the subsequent intervention of 'U.N.' troops, two years during which the author of this book, a liberal journalist on the staff of the *New York Daily Compass*, has moved from a position of accepting the official version of accounts to one described by Claude Bourdet in *L'Observateur* in the following words: 'If Stones's thesis corresponds to reality, we are in the presence of the greatest swindle in the whole of military history . . . a terrible manœuvre in which deception is being consciously used to block peace when it is possible.'

Stone brings out in the most detailed treatment yet seen in any single book on the Korean war that not only was the outbreak not a surprise to the United States but that on the admission of Assistant Secretary of State John D. Hickerson in June, 1951, his Department had prepared a resolution calling for U.N. action in the event of war in Korea long before fighting broke out. Stone, among other points, recalls the visit of Dulles to Korea and Japan following which the statement was made that 'positive action to preserve peace in the Far East' would be taken. Yet, and this is one of several weaknesses in a remarkable book, the best conclusion he can come to on the responsibility for the Korean war is that 'the big powers were victims, among other victims, of headstrong satellites itching for a showdown which Washington, Moscow and Peking had long anticipated but were alike anxious to avoid'. A much more logical conclusion of the above facts and the many others which Stone adduces would be to conclude that the Korean war was an American-organised blood-bath.

Among these other facts are: that ships were already standing by *to evacuate American families* from South Korea before the war broke out (p. 2); that the United Nations' 'field observers' made a tour of duty at the front from June 9 to 24, finishing one day before the war started, thus providing 'a remarkably convenient alibi' (p. 10); MacArthur's speech at the Seoul celebrations in 1948 when Rhee was installed, at which he said: 'this barrier (the 38th Parallel) must and will be torn down' (p. 14). Many others will jump out of the pages at the reader.

A further weakness is the failure to place the Korean war against a background of world economic and political events such as the signs of developing economic crisis in the U.S. in 1950, the terrific impact of campaign around the signing of the Stockholm Appeal and the growing demand for positive peaceful policies in the U.S. at that time which brought about the resolution

WAGES, WORK, PEACE AND WORKING CLASS UNITY

CONFERENCE

of special interest to trade unionists and economists arranged by

Economic Sub-Committee of the Communist Party

Royal Hotel, Woburn Place, London, W.C.1, Sunday, August 31st, from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. *Speakers:* John Eaton, Ron Francis, William Mennell and others. Admission by Party card.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

introduced by Senator McMahon calling for world disarmament discussions.

On the subject of MacArthur, his conduct of the war and his military communiqués, Stone presents a cross-check with the facts as known and the despatches filed by reliable military correspondents. He shows in a fascinating and detailed analysis that MacArthur's steadily-pursued aim was to provoke intervention by People's China, and bring about a situation in which he could appeal for the war to be extended, the atom bomb used and Chiang Kai-shek given full U.S. support. As MacArthur developed his political strategy in late 1950 and early 1951 Stone shows how the North Korean forces (according to General MacArthur) miraculously rose from complete destruction to 34 divisions in a few weeks. While MacArthur was preparing public opinion for large-scale war and was screaming of the hordes of hundreds of thousands of Chinese troops pushing him back down the Korean peninsula, Stone shows from official communiqués that MacArthur had broken off all contact with the North Korean forces and, in fact, had only a few Chinese prisoners-of-war in his hands. An extraordinary state of affairs if his call for further extension of the war because of overwhelming pressure were true. In truth, the facts show clearly, and Stone brings them out, that the Chinese volunteers only came into the picture when the Yalu River power installations were threatened.

This is a courageous book which, properly used, can be a weapon for peace. It throws a clear light on the present criminal treatment of prisoners-of-war seen by American imperialism as pawns to be sacrificed to the main policy of avoiding peace at all costs. T. McW.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

CHINA

All the Chinese I came in contact with, however relatively moderate or extreme, all were and are convinced that the chief and most immediate task is to get rid of imperialism. They have no illusions about the Chinese capitalists and landlords, but the greatest curse, they declare, is the foreign imperialist, and in this they are undoubtedly right; and of all the imperialist forces in China beyond any question Great Britain is the worst. On arrival in Hankow, at the beginning of April, I counted thirty-one gunboats, destroyers, and cruisers on the Yangtze, ten of these were British, ten American, another ten being Japanese, and one Italian. These were proudly displaying bunting amounting to, I should estimate, fully two thousand flags, in front of the Concessions and ex-Concessions. The Chinese workers deserve and ought to get the active assistance of the workers of the West, and most certainly from the workers of Britain, in getting rid of the imperialists.

From *My Visit to China*, by Tom Mann, August, 1927.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Ltd. (T.U.), Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eastern sea board an American trade unionist writes: 'Keep up your good work for peace. Many of us hereabouts are raising our voices for peace and more and more people are listening to us where they wouldn't listen before. The peace forces have a tough job here in this hysteria-ridden corrupted racist atmosphere, but we know that we are right and that we shall win.' Nor is his the only country to know hysteria; we have glimpsed it here from those who utter 'hymns of hate, howling to have "simple Truth miscall'd Simplicity,"' to quote an English reader. Back to our American friend; he says that since he subscribed to *L.M.* a year ago, he has 'received experiences in good reading, exciting writing and sober Marxist analysis. Sorry I can't send more than a small donation; but here in this land of immense wealth and "opportunity" I, as well as millions of other workers, find it difficult to make ends meet.' Perhaps you feel that he rates too highly the force of progressive ideas among the American working class? The Chairman of a large Industrial Corporation clearly wouldn't agree with you; for he—or his Promotion chief—buy half page advertisement space explaining to other business men 'How YOU can sell the Capitalist System.' I quote two pearls only from this: *Pearl One.* 'The time spent to fight labor could be better used to convince labor that its fortunes are tied up inextricably with ours.' *Pearl two.* 'If business men would relate their defense of free enterprise to those higher values with which all humanity is concerned—the defense of freedom and peace —they could sell the capitalist system much more effectively and with much less resistance.' Ah, if . . . .!

HOLIDAY MONEY

In Britain despite the fact that we are in holiday time, I note that nevertheless there is a growing number of new *L.M.* Discussion Groups and collective circulation efforts. But the fund is affected by holiday needs; despite our sturdy Scottish regular who collects three months ahead, while he saves his holiday money, to make quite sure that *L.M.* will not go short when he and his friends return with pockets empty. June total:

£46 14s. 10d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'Exeter', standing-in for Birmingham, Coventry, Crediton, *Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Southampton, Turton (Lancs.), and Weymouth 18s.*; *'Billie'*, standing-in for Tonypandy, 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.; J. Tuckett, standing-in for Manchester (pre-paid); F. C. (U.S.A.), standing-in for Willingdon (pre-paid).

STEADY MONEY came from 'Exeter', 2s.; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; P. O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; C. B., 'Bristol', 3s.; J. H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; 'Swansea', 10s.; 'Chicago', 28s.; 'New York' (pre-paid); Anon. 'Jo'burg' (pre-paid); K. and J. E., 'East Edinburgh' (pre-paid); D. G. and P. W., £5; H. J., £10; 'Red Sergeant', 5s.; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. Tuckett (pre-paid); D. Rees (pre-paid); H. G. B., 2s.; E. D. McCallum, 10s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; W. S. Farnell, 5s.; M. Philibert, 10s.; E. J. B., £1; 'L'Humanite', 3s.; H. Willcox, 5s.; Tam O'Shanter and 'Grey Mare', 5s.; 'Finchley Discussion Group', 10s.; J. Macdonald, 10s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, £1; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; R. F. B., £3; F. Renouf, 5s.; R. McLeod, 10s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; O. Greene, £2; D. M., 6s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. Purton, 7s. 6d.

Other contributions include: C. G. Roberts, 12s.; W. L. Dutton, 1s.; J. MacLanachan, 2s.; H. Idle, 12s.; R. Stubbs, 2s.; W. H. Miller, 7s.; W. M. Osler, 5s.; F. Day, 7s.; R. Boughton, 5s.; J. G. Barker 2s.; H. I. Miller, 1s.; D. Mennie, 1s.; E. Williams, 5s.; D. R. Morgan, 2s.; B. D. Youatt, 12s.; P. Brodetsky, 3s.; T. D. Culbert, 2s.; 'St. Pancras Reader', 1s. 6d.; E. Newmark, 12s.; H. Lubbock, £4 2s.; W. J. Sell, 2s.; T. Graham, 8s.; G. Davies, 1s.; B. H. Steel, 7s.; H. Daffern, £1 0s. 7d.; D. Goodfellow, 2s.; H. Humphrey, 4s.; V. I. T. (U.S.A.), 11s.; D. H. S. (S.A.), 16s. 6d.; W. I. Davies, 1s.; H. R. Stringer, 2s.; L. Heslop, 5s.; C. G. Taff, 2s.; G. Procter, 2s.; W. V. S. (Canada), 7s. 3d.; P. J. Wallis, 7s.; M. A. H. (S.A.), 6s. 6d.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Co-op. No.: L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Monthly PAMPHLETS

TRUTH ABOUT THE U.S.S.R.
by
D. N. PRITT, Q.C.
(6d.)

CONCERNING PRACTICE
by
MAO TSE-TUNG
(6d.)

UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF WILLIAM MORRIS
by
R. PAGE ARNOT
(1s.)

Order from bookshops, or Dept. G, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

PEOPLE'S CHINA

This splendid fortnightly describes all sides of life in the New China. It comprises 32 pages; 4-page illustrated supplement; Political, Economic, Social and Cultural sections.

Price: 6d. a copy, 12s. a year.

Order from 40, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

Why not write for Specimen Copy to Britain-China Friendship Association, 17, Bishops Bridge Road, London, W.2

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

August issue includes:

"Malayan Rubber: Profits and Prospects"
"The Transport Bill"
"The Position of Tied Cottages"

Monthly 9d.; p.a., 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name .....
Address .....

(2) Name .....
Address .....

You may mention my name, Signed.....
or/I enclose note to be sent on. Address .....
.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED